



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## LIBERAL JUDAISM IN ENGLAND: ITS DIFFICULTIES AND ITS DUTIES.

It is scarcely necessary to start this article by an attempt at definition. The kind of Judaism which the word "liberal" is intended to imply will become adequately clear in the sequel. For the present I will merely assume that the term has a real, and more or less definite meaning. But if I evade definition at the outset, I hope that otherwise I shall be able to make my words and phrases plain. The subject is too important for ambiguity.

It is tolerably certain that there are many persons in England who may rightly be described as liberal Jews, though their attachment or relation to Judaism may vary from close to remote. But these liberal Jews have no organization or coherence. It can hardly be said that the so-called reform synagogue in London, with its allies in Manchester and Bradford, fulfils such an end. A large number of the London and Manchester members at any rate, including some of the most earnest and prominent, would repudiate the appellation "liberal" in the sense in which it will be used in this article. It seems therefore true to say that liberal Judaism in England has no organized expression or embodiment.

It may be asked: What are the reasons for this lack of organization? Are the liberal Jews so tiny a minority that they must remain as scattered units among a vast and organized majority of conservatives? This is unlikely; in London alone there would in all probability be more than enough "liberal" Jews to found and maintain a large synagogue of their own. The true explanation must

rather be sought in a number of considerations, not all of which are wholly creditable to the "liberal" Jews themselves.

(1) A new movement requires a master mind, an urgent apostle, to take the lead and show the way. Such a person has not yet arisen amongst us. Meanwhile, though a large number of persons feel, more or less consciously, that the position of conservative Judaism is as untenable as its embodiment is unattractive, they are by no means agreed as to what should or could be put in its place. They realize, more or less fully, the great complexity of the problem, the intricacy and delicacy of the whole matter. They are (more or less consciously) perplexed, harassed and benumbed by the difficulties of "reform," by the difficulties which every suggested form of liberal Judaism, whether in theoretic expression or in outward embodiment, presents to the critical understanding. It is tolerably easy to know what "liberal Judaism" does not or cannot mean; it is far less easy to decide what it does. For within its borders there is doubtless included a considerable divergency of opinion and belief. And this variety would naturally make concerted action more difficult, or even hinder its inception.

(2) There exists a great dislike of strife and disunion. It is so far easier to abstain and do nothing. There are "conservative" members of the family to be considered. Pain would be inflicted upon a near relative. A mere abstention from synagogue causes no disturbance or irritation; to attend a synagogue where the service was entirely in English would be far more disliked; to be instrumental in founding such a one would be worst of all. Most persons shrink from family feuds and from the infliction of pain. Liberals, not unnaturally, are able to sympathize with and to appreciate the conservative position; the conservatives show a perhaps equally natural incapacity to understand the position of liberals.

(3) The time is considered inopportune. (And what a

relief it is when difficult action can be indefinitely postponed on the cogent ground of inopportunity!) It is argued that the practical problems which beset the community are so grave and large that nothing should be done to divide and disunite. Theoretical questions must be postponed till a more convenient season. Practical workers of every shade of opinion must combine to tackle practical difficulties. Again, when the condition of the Jews in foreign countries is so grave as it is now, the time is unsuited for contentious movements. English Jews in particular must present a united front in order, when occasion offers, to help their brethren in faith upon the continent of Europe or in other lands. The measure of truth in this argument is apparent to all.

(4) It must also be admitted that there are many "liberal" Jews, who may rightly be dubbed as "indifferentists." Religion does not appeal to some; to others Judaism is far off and uninteresting. There are many, in all probability, who are dissatisfied with that which is, but who would not put themselves to any trouble or inconvenience in order to seek a remedy. They will remain quietly discontented and distant, while their children may be expected to drop off more completely still, or to join other religious denominations.

These four reasons give a tolerably comprehensive explanation for the unorganized condition of liberal Judaism. It cannot be said that I have attempted to depict the situation too favourably. Let me now indicate the dangers and drawbacks which the present condition of affairs involves and implies.

(1) From the religious point of view, a considerable number of Jews are becoming, gradually but increasingly, alienated from the community. No religious body can view a fact of this kind with equanimity or unconcern.

(2) Some of these Jews may become lost to religion. Some may continue religious in one of two ways: either they may join some other religious body (e.g. the Unitarians),

or they may be capable of preserving religion in their own lives and souls without any close relation to any particular denomination and without any outward or definite "forms." It is true that an unattached religiousness such as this may be of the purest kind and of the highest worth ; but herein lies the gist of the third drawback or evil of the present situation.

(3) A considerable amount of potential, and a certain amount of developed religiousness and spirituality are actually being lost to the community and to Judaism. Both the possibilities, or rather both the actualities, here mentioned are grievous to contemplate. If many Jews are becoming non-religious, who could have been kept within the religious fold by an organized presentation of liberal Judaism, the responsibility resting upon the liberals is great. Moreover, the non-religious Jew is beset by peculiar temptations. Having lost his religion, he too often becomes a materialist. The other phases of idealism, outside of religion, do not in many cases adequately attract him. The highest idealism being lost, no lower form seems able even partially to supply its place. That the Jew, whose very existence stands for religion and for nothing else at all, should be lost to religion is a crying anomaly ; it is a disgrace, almost a scandal. Scarcely less sad, though far less serious for humanity as a whole, is it to think that Judaism is not only unable to foster and develop all potential religiousness within its own borders, but that some developed religiousness of a high order is actually lost to the Jewish stream. It is not indeed lost to the world. "Spirits are not finely touched but to fine issues." But it is lost to Judaism. It does not fructify and improve it. It does not increase the spiritual store, it does not raise the religious level, of the community itself. To every reader of this article there are probably known two or three persons to whom the foregoing sentences closely and pre-eminently apply. That they live their religious life outside of the community and of Judaism

does not in their case impair its worth ; it is the community and Judaism which are the losers.

May we provisionally use the term "liberal Jews" to indicate the persons (admittedly a considerable number) to whom the Jewish religion, as it is currently expounded, and as in outward form and embodiment it actually exists, does not seem to appeal? Of these persons, some, being more or less indifferent to religion altogether—their interests or even their ideals lie in other directions—would hardly seem to belong to the category under review. Even as to them the grave question still, however, remains: to what cause is their present indifference due? Others again may be justly called "religious," but their religion is more or less independent of, and, as *they* think, unrelated to Judaism. Those who form the first two divisions might perhaps be called "nominal" Jews. A third division includes all those who, as regards their religion, feel convinced that it is both "liberal" and Jewish. Strictly, the term "liberal Jews" should be only applied to these, but, as an actual fact, the persons who are included in the second and third divisions shade off into each other, and are not separated by any hard and fast lines. To many in the second division sentiment (more racial than religious perhaps, but yet not racial only) takes the place of reasoned conviction. But a more or less definite Jewish consciousness is the result.

Now let us ask, generally, what are the causes of the dissatisfaction of the liberal and nominal Jews with existing Judaism? The answer is complicated. Doubtless the fundamental reason would be that belief in many of the tenets of orthodox Judaism has waxed cold. In the present age of religious doubt and uncertainty, the same influences which alienate the Christian from the Church alienate the Jew from the Synagogue. But in the case of the Jews there are other reasons of a different kind. Of these we have first to speak. For one has to remember that definite and reasoned beliefs are not the property of

many. For one person who has become a nominal Jew because he no longer believes in miracles, there are ten who drop off from those other reasons which we have now to consider.

It will be convenient to preface the subject by asking one more question: Why do so many of those "liberal" Jews, who are not indifferent to religion altogether, yet seldom or never attend public worship in a synagogue?

Now one must not confound attachment to Judaism with attendance at Synagogue. There are many persons, not only religious, but possessed of a Jewish religious consciousness, who *under existing circumstances* do not care to attend the Synagogue services. But Synagogue attendance has, nevertheless, a double signification. First of all, those persons who have lost their Jewish religious consciousness do *also* cease to enter the Synagogue; and, secondly, a prolonged abstention from the Synagogue *may* cause or accelerate the loss of the Jewish religious consciousness as well. For the Synagogue service is the outward symbol of the corporate sense—the sense of belonging to a community, to a distinct religious brotherhood. One can indeed retain a vivid sense of being religiously a Jew without the Synagogue, but as human nature is, and as we Jews live now, it is difficult, and needs very anxious and deliberate care. I shall later on have to urge that under existing circumstances, when on the one hand the existing Synagogue services are so unsympathetic to many, and on the other hand the chance of successfully organizing more "liberal" services seems as yet so small, this anxious and deliberate care has become a most solemn and urgent duty. But this is to anticipate.

I have often asked an old and dear friend of mine, who is one of the class now under discussion, to write an article for this REVIEW called: "Why I do not go to Synagogue." He has expressed his willingness to do this if the article may be anonymous. It is the old story. That he does not attend Synagogue does not pain his

relatives, or at any rate, they have grown completely accustomed to the situation. That he should give his reasons would, however, cause them pain. Under the rule by which anonymous articles are not accepted in this REVIEW, my request fell through; if my friend reads this paper, I hope he will find that I have included some, if not most, of the reasons which he himself—a far better authority!—would have given us.

(1) The first reason doubtless is that the services are conducted in Hebrew. Rightly or wrongly, of necessity or through indifference, many English Jews are imperfectly acquainted with Hebrew, and quickly forget what they learned as children. Hebrew is no longer an attraction; on the contrary it is a deterrent.

(2) The service itself is found to be uninteresting. A large part of it is taken up by the Reading of the Law, which is often dull and unspiritual. The method of reading makes the portion even longer than it need otherwise be.

(3) There is too little modernity or concession to western ideas and feelings. There is no organ; the singing is poor; there are no English hymns in which the congregation can join.

(4) The sexes are separated. The wife cannot sit by her husband; the mother cannot sit by her son. Orientalism pervades the service.

(5) The general result is unsatisfying to many. Hence the suspicion arises as to whether an unsatisfied attendant at Synagogue had not better become a regular abstainer. Is he not playing the part of a hypocrite, professing or appearing to believe what he does not believe, and injuring rather than advancing the cause of morality and truth? "What good," it is asked, "in the higher sense of the word, does the Synagogue do to me; and what good, in the higher sense of the word, do I do to others by attending its services?"

(6) In this catalogue of reasons it would be cowardly



to ignore the question of Saturday. Most of our leaders shut their eyes to its gravity. But the policy of the ostrich, though convenient, is also dangerous. What the right solution is it is extremely difficult to see; and for the present the unsatisfactory *status quo* may be less dangerous than any measure of change. But where one member of a family—and especially its head—is regularly absent from Synagogue, it is inevitable but that his example should have a serious influence upon all the rest.

I will not discuss how far all these objections are well founded. That there is some truth in them can hardly be denied. A reason, often perhaps overlooked, why they have special force with many liberal and cultivated persons is that the Synagogue is contrasted with the chapel or the church. Some who are not disturbed by differences of dogma find their religious feelings better stimulated by a beautiful service in a church; others, to whom Jewish and Christian Monotheism seem merely temporary varieties of an eternal reality above them both, are not unnaturally attracted by the simple, intelligible, and modern service of a Unitarian chapel. This last consideration is connected with a more general feeling about Judaism as a whole that it is an essentially oriental religion, which does not harmonize with the other sides and aspects of our full-fledged western lives. There are, for instance, aesthetic elements in Judaism, but they are not suited to western conditions and minds. Some rites are unaesthetic altogether. Contrast, for example, the initiatory rites of baptism and circumcision. The dogmas and the narratives which underlie both may be equally untrue; but the one is capable of spiritualization, the other is not. Circumcision, connected as it is with primordial ideas and practices of a highly superstitious and barbarous kind, is a great stumblingblock for modern minds, whether from the aesthetic, the spiritual, or the critical point of view.

These considerations pave the way for the more general reasons of the dissatisfaction felt by many liberal or nominal

Jews with existing Judaism. Dissatisfaction is perhaps not altogether the right word: in many cases one might more accurately speak of aloofness or estrangement.

Before the days of emancipation, before the days when in school and university and club, in business and charity, in public affairs and social intercourse, the Jew began to mix freely with the Christian; in older days still, when the Jew did not read non-Jewish books or think non-Jewish thoughts, his life and environment were all of a piece. How different from now. There are many English Jews whose surroundings are almost completely non-Jewish. In addition to the influences of school and college, their friends, their work, their interests are all away and aloof from Judaism. The books they read are wholly non-Jewish. Their *real* religion is perhaps largely obtained from poets, such as Browning and Tennyson. Official Judaism is quite remote from their lives and thoughts; they know very little about it. Some persons there are whose minds are so constituted that they are unperceptive of disharmonies; there are others again whose minds are, as it were, made up of several and separate compartments. They do not want their religion, whether as doctrine or as outward form, to be related to the rest of their lives. But to the larger number the dissonance is (more or less consciously) disagreeable and unsatisfactory. Judaism does not seem as yet to have fully adapted itself to the changed conditions under which it has to live. Perhaps it has not fully realized that a man's real and vital religion is moulded and enriched nowadays from many other sources than the Bible, public worship, or ceremonial exercises. Conversation, reading (whether it be of poets, philosophers, essayists, novelists, or what not), music and painting, all contribute. These *ex hypothesi*, in the cases now under consideration, are mainly non-Jewish. If a man is not receptive to their influences, so far as religion is concerned, he may become non-religious altogether. If he is receptive to them, the religion he acquires may be, if not *un-Jewish*, at all events

independent of the Synagogue or even of Judaism. It is not therefore to be wondered at that the number of "nominal" Jews should tend to increase. Any organized creed which desires to keep its hold upon those born within its pale must reckon with these other sources of religion, and either harmonize with them, or counteract or control them. Judaism, as the small minority, cannot achieve the third. There remains harmony or counteraction. The second can no longer be attempted with success for those for whom it would be most required. But is not harmony still feasible?

We have to press the probing knife still deeper. For many of us are aware that this feasibility is denied by most persons of education and thought who are outside the Jewish limits. They think that Judaism cannot become a religion for the West. A Reformed Judaism must, they think, be a mere transition to some form of "Unitarianism" or "Theism." It is probable that this view is partly operative, in a more or less inarticulate sort of way, in the minds of many liberal Jews. Its grounds, as they present themselves to such persons, are, I believe, the following:

(1) The conception of Judaism, which our Prayer-books and public worship imply, is that of a perfect law given to Moses and recorded by him in a book known as the Pentateuch. All cultivated persons, and very many uncultivated ones as well, know that each term of this proposition is inaccurate. The law is not perfect; it was not given to Moses; it was not recorded by him in a book. The present writer fully admits the gravity of this contrariety between theory and fact. A sort of critical shiver runs through him when at each Synagogue service the sacred scroll is elevated, and the solemn words are proclaimed: "This is the Law which Moses set before the children of Israel." But can Judaism free itself from this difficulty and remain Judaism still?

(2) Connected with this Pentateuchal problem, and

including it, are the larger questions concerning Revelation, Inspiration and Miracles, which affect both Jew and Christian, though in different ways and proportions.

(3) Another difficulty is connected with considerations which have been touched upon before. We have seen that the environment of many English Jews is entirely non-Jewish. Even if such persons do not read directly religious literature, they often read semi-religious books such as *In Memoriam* and *Sesame and Lilies*. Such books are more or less Christian in character. It is their common assumption that the most noble life which has ever been lived is the life of Jesus Christ, and that the highest and purest religious teaching, hitherto achieved, was given by him. The New Testament itself is no longer a closed book to many Jews. They are aware that, whether officially or unofficially, a large number of Christians no longer believe in the divine birth and miraculous resurrection of Jesus, and nevertheless regard him as their religious master. The book of his life and teaching is very attractive. Yet Judaism does not as yet seem able to take up towards the New Testament and its hero an adequately comprehending attitude. It is still (in the eyes of many liberal and nominal Jews) too disposed to ignore or deny the new contributions to religion which the writers of the New Testament have made.

(4) But can Judaism be "reformed"? It is idle to deny that there are many persons who, without belief in the *truth* of orthodox Judaism, have also little belief in reform. The common objection is that Judaism cannot adapt itself to critical conclusions or to the modern spirit without divesting itself of its racial or national integuments, and that it cannot divest itself of these integuments without ceasing to be Judaism. Here then we have the familiar difficulty of Scylla and Charybdis. A national religion is disliked. In the liturgy the perpetual emphasis of "Israel" grates upon the ear. For that perpetually recurring term some would desire to substitute "humanity." Yet, on the other hand, it is believed that to denationalize is to destroy. In

Judaism it is supposed that religion and race must go hand in hand. There are even those who say: "While as a religion Judaism does not appeal to us, it has old and tender associations as a picturesque collection of family customs and national traditions. Your cold and colourless reform Judaism is neither the one thing nor the other."

(5) Preachers are wont to speak of the religious mission of Judaism. But there is an uncomfortable feeling that it has not been sufficiently indicated what that mission exactly is. Judaism, it is said, "produced" Christianity; but what religious work have the Jews accomplished since, or what religious work is there still left for them to do? The usual answer is that their mission is to spread or to maintain the pure Monotheistic idea. This reply, however, even if adequate, does not provoke adequate enthusiasm. It is argued or it is felt that Monotheism will come of itself. Already a large number of "nominal" Christians have private doubts about the Divinity of Christ. No one can say that these doubts have arisen because of Judaism or by the influence of Judaism. Further doubts, then, will come in the same way. Again, if the only object of Judaism is the maintenance of the Monotheistic idea, why may not Jews, if they please, join Unitarian or Theistic communities? The fundamental doctrine of the Divine Unity is equally maintained by them. "Theism" avoids those harassing difficulties of criticism and race which perplex and trouble the modern and philosophic Jew. Again, the very liberality of modern Judaism stands a little in its way. It is regularly preached that by far the most important thing is conduct, that members of the most various denominations can all lead pure and noble and self-sacrificing lives. The doctrine is wholesome and true, but it is inevitable that, under the influence of it, many persons should ask whether the speculative error of even orthodox Christians (who, after all, are not idolaters) is of so very much consequence. To add to the difficulty, modern Judaism almost boasts of being a non-proselytizing religion. Is it to be wondered

at that there are persons who ask whether it can be so necessary to maintain a religion which it is so unnecessary to communicate to others? The duty of mere existence is unattractive; it does not stimulate active devotion. It does not adequately appeal to the minds and imaginations of men.

(6) It must be fully conceded by all, whether we like it or no, that religious sentiment or emotion among the Jews of England was, in the past, largely maintained by feelings of race. Now among the more cultured Jews of England, race feelings are largely passing away. And this for three reasons. First, English Jews have become Englishmen, fully identified with their fellow citizens of other creeds in national feeling, habits and thoughts. Secondly, there is no anti-Semitism in England, and therefore English Jews are not driven back into their own community for all social intercourse and public work. Men and women, whether of Teutonic or Semitic blood, mix freely with each other. Thirdly, the modern idea is extending that religion should *not* be limited by race. That Judaism should be a purely national religion is an irritating limitation. But a new sentiment to supplant the old is not yet full blown. Thus the three elements, which some would say supply the driving force in most religions, are all being weakened. The old belief in the Perfect Law is evaporating; the rites which that Law ordered or suggested are no longer being observed; and lastly, the old religious sentiment, which depended on or was mixed up with racial or national considerations, is also cooling down and dwindling away. Hence the Jew grows increasingly aloof from Judaism, and Judaism seems to him more and more distant and unappealing.

Nor can it fairly be urged that these reasons are exaggerated or imaginary. Some of them doubtless are felt more by one person, and some by another. By one they are regularly formulated; in another they may be only sub-conscious. But they are, I think, sufficiently

real, numerous and grave, to make it certain that the fact of there being so many "nominal" Jews in England is not merely because of indifferentism, ignorance, or sloth. No doubt all these are contributing causes; but, taken alone and by themselves, they do not sufficiently explain the facts.

The object of all that has hitherto been said is to make the situation clear. The purpose of what follows is to set forth some reasons why liberal Jews should not be discouraged and become alienated, and why nominal Jews should remain nominal no longer. The one urgent requirement is that the Jewish religious consciousness should be actively and vividly maintained. The liberals and nominals must feel themselves Jews by religion, and not merely Jews by race; they must teach this consciousness to their children and hand it down from generation to generation. Out of and through this consciousness, as its deliberate expression and issue, they must seek to live the religious life. It is a secondary, though by no means an unimportant matter how this Jewish religious consciousness is to express itself in outward form and embodiment. It may do so by separate services and Synagogues, answering to its own inward and liberal beliefs; it may do so by clinging, in spite of much that is repellent and distasteful, to existing institutions, and attempting to liberalize from within; it may retreat within the home, and, for a time, give up any public worship or collective organization: but, whichever method or methods it may adopt, its great and predominating object must be the maintenance in all fervour and purity of the distinct and definite religious consciousness within every Jewish soul.

Why, then, should Jews remain Jews? The question implies that there *is* something worth staying for. And I must be prepared to answer the doubt of the nominal Jew, who may ask (either sadly or indifferently): "Is Judaism reformable?" or again: "Are we to maintain our keen Jewish consciousness, and perchance also our active

membership of the Synagogue, for our own sakes, or for the sake of other Jews, or for the sake of the outer world?"

There is little doubt that the last alternative contains the real kernel of the problem. If for the sake of the world, that is for the sake of religion, we ought all to retain our Jewish consciousness, then the greater clearly includes the less. But if Judaism, so far as the world goes, is doomed and useless, then it might be argued that the sooner we all abandon it the better. Let us, through "mixed marriages," hasten our own dissolution, and no longer attempt to buttress up an anachronism. Instead of remaining a Jew myself, would not the better or wiser thing be for me to join a Unitarian or Theistic body without delay, and to urge my friends to do the same? Above all, why perchance am I to be false to that which, in our individual and personal lives, is the highest and holiest thing we know, unless I can honestly believe that my renouncement of love's satisfaction is a sacrifice for religion? There is no good (and some evil), it may be said, in the continued existence of the Jews, unless that existence is continued for a conscious religious purpose, and for that purpose alone.

But if Judaism, as a separate religious body, need not continue to exist, it is not now, and never again will be, of any use to the cause of Theism. That seems to me a tremendous assumption; and yet the man or woman who withdraws from the community, or contracts a purely mixed marriage, does logically (so far as I can make out) approve of and endorse it.

What does Judaism stand for? First of all for a pure, but a very uncompromising Theism. Judaism (rightly or wrongly—for *this* of course cannot here be discussed)—Judaism admits of no paltering or faltering with the Divine idea. It does not allow it to be whittled away. Orthodox and reform Judaism alike preach a *real* God, self-conscious or more than self-conscious, personal or more than personal, "in" the world if you please, but also above



it, beyond it—a God who is the living source of knowledge and of goodness, a God to whom prayer is no mockery, a God who in a real sense is the “ruler” of the world and of man. No less than this is included in the Jewish doctrine of God. No less than this must be believed by those who would prefer to think of God as a Power or a Force rather than as a Person; and who yet may wish, if it be possible, to regard themselves religiously as Jews. “To the old belief in him” they must return, “but with corrections. He is a person, but not like ourselves; a mind, but not a human mind; a cause, but not a material cause; nor yet a maker or artificer. The words which we use are imperfect expressions of his true nature, but we do not therefore lose faith in what is best and highest in ourselves and in the world.” To every kind of Pantheism, as to all Positivisms and “Ethical” religions without God, Judaism offers a stern and uncompromising opposition. I am not here arguing whether Judaism is right or wrong. All I want to make clear is what Judaism stands for, what it lives and what it dies for.

Again, Judaism proclaims a religion in the closest possible association with morality and truth<sup>1</sup>. Jewish Theism need never be reactionary. It can be the ally of knowledge, pure, free from superstition, bracing, moral. But Judaism has two mighty foes. On the one hand, all reactionary religious forces, such as on the whole and in its predominating elements and organizations the Roman Catholic Church seems to us to be, on the other all non-Theistic forces, including Positivism, Agnosticism, and Materialism.

Let me not be misunderstood. I am not judging or even criticizing these systems: by calling them *foes* I do not mean to call them *names*. If they are our foes, we are theirs; the fight between us can be conducted on the most

<sup>1</sup> I do not for a moment mean to imply that other religions are not also associated with morality and truth. All I mean is that Judaism seems to me, in its vital essence, to be peculiarly capable of the closest association with them.

fair and honourable lines, and can easily consort with the closest possible friendship between individuals in the various opposing camps.

A staunch liberal and a staunch conservative would say the same sort of thing about conservatism and liberalism respectively: but they would nevertheless not scruple to avow that the principles for which they fought were of the utmost value and importance.

Perhaps then some "nominal" Jews may not have realized sufficiently the tremendous significance of the conceptions, the principles, the doctrines—call them by whatever name you will—which Judaism "stands for" and maintains. It will be observed that I have not specifically named the dogma of the Divine Unity. That is not because I do not appreciate its importance, but because it has, I think, been looked at in too narrow a way. It has been treated as a sort of barren abstraction, a narrow shibboleth without vital implications. But the question is not merely whether you believe in one God or in many gods, in a God of one aspect, or of three aspects, or of a million aspects (and for my part I can easily imagine that the one God has any number of aspects); but what sort of god your one God is, and what is his relation to man and to morality. It will be seen, at any rate, that Judaism stands and fights for conceptions of solemn importance, for which, if we believe in them, it is immensely worth our while to make important sacrifices of leisure, inclination, and convenience. "Leisure, inclination, and convenience": these words in this connexion seem trivial and unworthy. These things, it may be said, we are willing to give; but we are not yet satisfied that they will be wisely given. Admitting that Judaism, in spite of many unsatisfactory accessories, and in spite of many rites and doctrines wherein we no longer believe, does yet "stand for" those great and solemn verities, you have not shown us that Judaism is the best method by which to propagate or to maintain them. Would it not be better for us to join a freer religious community, one in

which there is less to be thrown off and rejected, which is more modern, more western, more liberal? Do not, for instance, religious teachers like Mr. Wicksteed or Mr. Voysey accept and propagate principles much the same as those which, as you allege, are the hall-mark of Judaism? Do they also not stand between Catholicism on the one hand, and Positivism or Agnosticism on the other?

If I have not been guilty of any serious omissions or flaws in the argument, it is of great value to have reached the present limiting alternative. One point can now be usefully made. The religious isolation of the individual cannot be the best possible service to the religious cause in which he believes. It may be a temporary necessity, but the best condition, both for him and for the cause, will be one in which his own religious life both strengthens and is strengthened by the community. Liberal Jews must not think that they best serve the cause of Theism by an abstention from the community in its corporate religious life. It may be that they feel at present unable to join in that life; it may be that circumstances are unfavourable to the creation of a distinct corporate religious life of their own; or it may be that the chosen apostle or teacher to create this life has not yet arisen; but in any case, the present condition of things must not be looked upon as either normal or satisfying. The individuals of rare religiousness and spirituality who now live aloof and apart are certainly not wasted. Their fair and holy lives, their lofty and noble personalities, influence those who can understand and appreciate them. "The effect of their being upon those around them" is "incalculably diffusive." Nevertheless they might do all this, and yet do more. The cause of religion, the cause of Jewish Theism, the power and purity of the community as a religious force, would be strengthened and increased, if these rare natures were an integral part of the religious organization to which they now only nominally belong. Their influence would be doubled; it

would be not merely individual, but also collective. Then the power and beauty of such natures would as it were be reflected back upon the community. In helping to transform and develop it, they would also be its outcome and expression.

For the majority of mortals, aloofness is not merely bad for the community, but also harmful for themselves. For them religious isolation is religious detriment. There is a parallelism, in this respect, between religion and morality. In his excellent little book, called "The Making of Character," Prof. MacCunn discusses with approval the prevailing Greek doctrine, that "character will never come to its best until the day that sees society reorganized as, at once, a school and sphere of virtue." In his chapter on "The Religious Organization," he points out how "Church membership can do much to quicken individual responsibility." He naturally alludes to the famous passage in the *Republic*, which has its bearing for religion as well as for ethics, about the philosopher whose "lot has fallen amidst adverse and evil social surroundings, and to whom it seems a hopeless struggle to make the society of which he is a member better." He, indeed, "holds his peace and goes his own way, content if only he can live his own life and be pure from evil and unrighteousness." And what he does is well. But it is not the best; for if he had found the right society, the fitting state, "*he would himself have reached a higher stage of growth*, and have secured his country's welfare, as well as his own." Plato's solemn words apply to religion as well as to morality.

The best and ideal thing would then be that the liberal and nominal Jew, for his own sake as well as for the sake of Theism, should take an active part in the corporate life of some religious organization. By so doing he would both give and gain. The religious life, as we have seen, is not wholly dissimilar in this respect to the citizen life. Here too there is a giving and a gaining in one and the same life. But it may still be asked: What religious organization

should the "nominal" Jew join? Should it be Judaism or another?

It must be understood that I am here discussing the subject only and solely from one particular point of view. To abandon the religious brotherhood of Israel now, when the large majority of that brotherhood are in such evil plight; when there is so much to be done; when all should stand by and give, if they can, a hand; when it is of the utmost importance that every good man and woman should emphatically acknowledge their membership in the community, and help by their mere acknowledgment and strenuous life to maintain its honour and its name;—to abandon the community *now* would seem the act of one without imagination, sympathy, or compassion. All I ask here is, whether *for the sake of Theism* the nominal and liberal English Jews would do better to join some other religious organization rather than to remain members of the Synagogue?

And just a word in explanation of the phrase: "for the sake of Theism." Am I making the mission of Judaism to consist in a matter of theology rather than of religion? Not so. But the service and the knowledge of God are reciprocally conditioned by one another. To know God as he is, is beyond man's ken and power. There is, moreover, a deep meaning in the teaching that the service of God produces a knowledge of him. God is, as it were, revealed to man more and more clearly by a certain attitude of mind and will, a certain trend of action. But the will and the life which make man more sure of God, and reveal to him more of the Divine character and nature, are themselves not without their theoretic basis. It is a working theory about God which shaped and directed the will and the life, and as this theory varies, so also must they. If a man's conception of God be, for example, that of the one self-conscious, eternal ideal of goodness and truth, his service of God will be coloured by his working theory. He will test all stories and books and dogmas about God by his own

highest conceptions of righteousness and truth. He will regard no service displeasing to God which is also dedicated to truth or to righteousness, no service commendable to God which impairs the supremacy of either the one or the other. The nature and existence of God are not merely the subject-matter of theology: they are the essence of religion. For religion without God is a misuse of words. The religious life implies an attitude towards an ideal *outside man*; it involves the belief that this ideal is the source of goodness and of truth, or in other words, that if there were no God, there would be no truth and no goodness. Without some theistic metaphysic, goodness and truth cannot, as I believe, maintain themselves. Is it not clear that if there be no God, goodness is a mere earthly episode, a mere transitory chance? Here on this earth man has grown out of the animal; he exists for a time; after a time he will pass away; he has learned to talk about love and righteousness and truth, but there is nothing beyond the earth which corresponds with these words or has created these conceptions. They chanced to appear; they will chance to disappear—chance creations as they are of varying sensations of pleasure and pain. And may we not go a step further and argue that goodness depends not only on the existence of God, but also on the belief in him? If, indeed, goodness and truth owe their being to God, it is impossible to suppose that God will suffer the belief in him to die out among men. But if, for the sake of argument, we assume that the belief did die out, then, as it seems to me, goodness itself would also gradually dwindle away. People would come to perceive that goodness in the old sense of the term had no super-human or extra-human sanction or source, and with that perception, the texture and quality of their goodness would gradually grow weaker and poorer. Woe then to the permanent stability of human goodness if man loses the belief in God! And for these reasons the cause of Theism includes, as it seems to me, the cause

of morality as well. Moreover, every phase of Theism involves a particular kind of belief about God, and this belief may determine and colour our actions. If we believe that God not merely hates sin but also the sinner, that in his universe there is such a thing as everlasting punishment, that he has favouritisms of race and creed, these beliefs can hardly help influencing our character and our deeds; or if we believe that God is near to man, that in some strange way he helps our struggles towards goodness and truth, that the relation of father and child is a true analogy of God's relation to ourselves, that God is one in such sort that in him justice is the same as love, and righteousness the same as mercy—will this belief not influence our service? It is true that service deepens the knowledge, but it is also true that knowledge (or, in other words, a working theory about God) directs the service. "For the sake of Theism" therefore includes "for the sake of religion." There is or should be sufficient unity in man to make his knowledge (or, if you will, his theories) ennoble his action, and his action deepen his knowledge. So too in theology and religion. In the last resort each religion must surely maintain: the truer the theology (i.e. the better and purer the working theory about God) the better the religion. Each religion has its saints and heroes; it is a hard saying that the religious life which one religion dictates and impels is superior to the religious life of another. But the votaries of each religion have to maintain (and they do so logically) that the religious life inculcated by their own particular creed is on the whole the fullest and the best. No less than this must be the claim of Judaism.

It is not denied or deniable that the outside Theisms have certain advantages for "liberals." They are freer, more western, more connected and in touch with the main stream of thought and culture; they make fewer demands upon patience and credulity. To some, Unitarianism may still be too Christian; to others, "Theism" may seem too

cold : but, speaking generally, the advantages which I have mentioned belong to them both. For individuals, therefore, to whom the romance of Judaism and the tribal or historic links which appeal so keenly to many minds no longer afford attraction, to whom, also, the urgent obligation to remain within the community at the present time of stress and storm is unrealized or unknown, the temptation to desert Judaism and to join Unitarianism or Theism may be very strong. From the purely individual point of view it becomes a matter of personal inclination and taste, of which there is no arguing. We have, however, to consider it in its relation to the community as a whole, and to the outer world.

Now this is a practical question which is before us, and we must regard it as practical men. It is clear that we have not to deal with large numbers ; we have to deal with driblets and individuals. There is no question of the Jews as a body, or even of a collected mass of them, giving up their separate religious organization and joining another. It is only a question of a few here and a few there. The other religious bodies then will not appreciably be strengthened. But on the other hand Judaism will appreciably lose. And the loss of Judaism would be the loss of Theism as well. For the Theism in which liberal Jews believe would best be served if all the eight or ten million Jews in the world were keen Theists in the liberal sense. They are Theists even now. Is their liberalism likely to come the sooner, if liberal Jews abandon the community ? It is a very serious and evil thing for a religious organization, if its liberal elements become alienated or indifferent. A reforming and transforming force is thereby removed. The steady pressure of a keen and increasing band of liberals must inevitably produce important results, supposing that pressure is maintained for an adequate and continuous time. If all the disaffected and nominal Jews were active members of the Synagogue, could they not make a considerable difference,



both in its services and ceremonial, and in the very conception and presentation of its teaching and doctrine? If the liberal forces are withdrawn, can liberals complain of conservatism and sterility? This argument will not be unfamiliar to many persons. It is the argument of the Broad Church party who desire to reform from within instead of destroying from without.

Again, without presuming to criticize either Mr. Voysey's community or the Unitarian Churches, it is reasonable to realize that they too have various difficulties and weaknesses of their own. The one is at present a small and solitary body, of recent origin, with no great historic past, and with small guarantees for its continuance and expansion. The other, from my Jewish point of view, is perhaps hardly separated with adequate sharpness and decision from orthodox Christianity; moreover, the children of Unitarians often marry into the Established Church, and their offspring is lost to Unitarianism. And liberal Jews, though they can approve and appropriate the nobler teachings of the New Testament, are not prepared to call themselves Christians. They are not prepared to call any man master; and none the more one of whose life and teaching, great and illustrious though they be, the records are so uncertain and contradictory, and bear such clear evidence of exaggeration and inventive arrangement. They still require no mediator between the human child and the Divine Father. Still would they turn the words of Paul against himself, and say : *ὁ μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἰς ἔστιν.*

Under these circumstances, the liberal or nominal Jew, while doing obvious harm to his own community, will confer no benefit upon the cause of Theism by joining another religious organization. Theism will best be served by two separate contingents, one Christian and one Jewish, each liberal and progressive, each in sympathy with one another, but each distinct and with its own peculiar differences and modifications. The cause of pure religion will best be served by Jews cleaving to Judaism and liberal-

izing it. Doing most good to our own brotherhood, we shall also do most good to the world. The second is involved in the first.

If this position be justifiable, our separatism is also justified. The Jews can only preserve themselves by refusing intermarriage. Otherwise the tiny minority would gradually be swallowed up by the majority. The true religious reason for Jewish separatism is so often misunderstood that it seems worth while and even necessary to dwell upon the subject in some detail.

It would be acknowledged on all hands that there may be more grounds or motives than one for the same action, and that two men may concur in the propriety of a given deed, although they differ as to its justification. This elementary fact may be applied to the question of Jewish separatism. It can be observed and justified from two different reasons. These two reasons may combine: a man may hold them both; but they may also be very sharply dissociated from each other. There is, then, first, the reason of race, and secondly, there is the reason of religion.

There are persons who, I believe, want to maintain the Jewish race quite apart from any religious consideration. There are some who would even go so far as to speak of the Jews as a "people" or a "nation," and would desire to keep up, as they call it, the national idea. Such persons would object to intermarriage on purely "racial" or "national" grounds. There are others who combine these grounds with motives of religion. There are others, again, who, while by no means assenting to the theory that the Jews are a nation, have yet a sort of sentimental, unreasoned, atavistic feeling of race, and dislike the notion of intermarriage. With all these I am in utter disagreement. If it were not so, I should indeed be guilty of a contradiction when I desire the "denationalization" of Judaism, and support the counter-theory of an "Englishman of the Jewish persuasion." A man can only belong to one nation

at a time. But, heart and soul an Englishman by nation, one can also be heart and soul a Jew by religion. But by religion only. The mere *race* is unimportant; it has no influence upon action. An Englishman may be proud of his Huguenot descent, but that makes no difference to his feelings and actions. A "French" Canadian is a Briton. I may be proud of my Jewish race (though what Jew knows whether his race is pure?), but it makes no difference to my action. In all tastes, feelings, and ideas—apart from religion—I have far more in common with a Christian Englishman than with a Bulgarian Jew. If it were not for religion, there would not, from my point of view, be the smallest objection to intermarriage. On the contrary, there would be very much indeed in its favour.

But quite different from all race reasons is the reason of religion. There is nothing racial or national about the Roman Catholic objection to intermarriage. It is purely a question of religion. The Roman Catholic authorities object to the diminution of their numbers which unrestricted intermarriage might bring about. In England, at any rate, where they are in a minority, they now make a condition that such marriages can only be allowed if the children are brought up as Catholics. Surely, if Roman Catholics, whose church is so powerful and so numerous, have their apprehensions, it is not unreasonable that Jews, who are everywhere in a minute minority, should have them as well. If the Synagogue were not officially so tied down to the letter of a hard and fast law, and so unable to meet new contingencies as they arise, it might perhaps be desirable to sanction mixed marriages on the same terms as they are sanctioned by Roman Catholics. But there would be two very obvious dangers in doing so. First, there could be no effective guarantees and securities that the engagements would be satisfactorily carried out, and secondly the children, even if brought up as Jews, would be themselves extremely likely to contract intermarriages without any safeguarding conditions. The tendency to revert to the

dominating religion of the overwhelming majority must necessarily be of enormous strength.

It may indeed be said: Why should a Jew not marry a Unitarian or a Theist? The answer is: Because of the children. If the Unitarian or Theist is willing to join our ranks, then the children are likely to be brought up as Jews and to marry Jews. If the marriage is "mixed," they may marry anybody, and are as likely as not to be merged in the general mass. The Jews must have and must cultivate a sense of a religious mission not yet completed. We should welcome others to our camp; we dare not ourselves abandon it. In the present religious condition of the world our responsibility to the Theistic cause is enormous. Every Jew who, with the utmost humility, feels that he has at all events *some* religious aspirations, *some* desire for the religious life, *some* living belief in God, should regard himself as a consecrated servant of Deity, and in spite of all difficulties remain faithful to his charge. Till the religious desirability of our dissolution is clearly apparent, let us not ourselves break the only bond which can hold a small and scattered religious organization together.

I am not indeed unconscious of the evils which the refusal of intermarriage entails. It can only be justified by the belief that the maintenance of Judaism as a separate religious organization is still of some religious benefit to the world; in more familiar words, that the Mission of Israel is not yet fully accomplished. But when the non-Jew is a "Unitarian" or a "Theist," whether by birth and conviction, or by conviction alone, and is willing to adopt Judaism and to become a Jew, the marriage involves no loss, and such marriages need not be discouraged. The conditions of proselytism should be made easy and gracious<sup>1</sup>. This should be one of the future aims of liberal Judaism.

<sup>1</sup> It may be said that while I would welcome the "Theist" if he will adopt Judaism, I do not desire the Jew to adopt Theism. Is not this

But it may still be asked: Are not the difficulties too great? It is all very well to tell "liberals" and "nominals" to cleave to the community, to bide their time, to "reform from within"; it is all very well to argue that their adhesion to Unitarianism or Theism will neither help their own fellow Jews nor the world at large; but how if this Judaism, to which they are to cling in the hope and with the aim of reforming it "in the third or fourth generation," is incapable of being "reformed." Are you not recommending them to pursue a Will-o'-the-wisp? Are you not perhaps hugging a delusion and setting up a chimera as your goal?

The reply to these questions can only be tentative. The final reply will be the fact. The difficulties will be solved *ambulando*—by experience and trial—or they will not be solved at all. Mere talk and theorizing will not do it. But we must not be scared by bogies. Nor must we accept too readily the opinion of our "orthodox" brothers and friends that Judaism can only exist in *their* conception and expression of it. Within *very* wide limits, it is surely true that the faith and the outward representation of that faith, which a number of Jews feel and desire to be Judaism, *is* Judaism. The mere fact that to their Jewish consciousness it *is* Judaism differentiates it from any other Theistic faith, which, both in the positive and negative aspects of doctrine, may otherwise most closely resemble their own. It is one phase of a religion which has taken and can take many different forms. The religion of (let us say) Akiba or Hillel differed pretty much as widely from the religion of a cultivated English orthodox Jew of to-day as the latter's religion differs (let us say) from mine. And if the first two are both phases of Judaism, I am not prepared to admit that the third is not a phase of it likewise. Judaism made a not wholly satisfactory alliance with Hellenism in the days of Philo.

unjust and unequal? The answer is that I am more convinced of the Theistic separateness and security of Judaism than of "Theism."

It can make a better alliance to-day. It can see more clearly.

People say that Judaism cannot be denationalized. Its race elements cannot be eliminated. They are its backbone, its spinal column. This argument is common to both orthodox Jews and to most outside critics. The former use it to show that Reform Judaism is, or must end in, the destruction of Judaism; the latter use it to show that Judaism as a modern religious force is and always must be a *quantité négligeable*. In the minds of many liberal and nominal Jews the suspicion lurks that the argument is sound. Hence their present dissatisfaction with the outward condition of Judaism seems to them founded upon a permanent necessity. Do what you will, it is alleged, the driving power of Judaism is contained in its fusion of religion and race. The poetry and passion, the emotional force and sympathetic bond of the religion all reside in and are dependent on the element of race. If that element has become distasteful, the very essence of the religion is distasteful, and if it is removed, the essence of the religion is removed likewise. "A national religion is an anachronism!" do you say? Agreed, respond the outside critics; but that only shows that Judaism itself is an anachronism, and its "reform" an impossibility.

Again, I would say: There can be no complete reply *on paper*. A certain exercise of faith is called for. But the phenomena of Reform Judaism in America show that denationalized Judaism is gradually becoming a reality. It is not contended that the process can be speedily accomplished; it may be that here in England present circumstances are not propitious for any even preliminary steps; but the German proverb holds good in religion, as in other departments of life: *Aufgeschoben ist nicht aufgehoben*. Many silent changes are taking place all in the direction of universalism and reform. It is noticeable that any new and special services now arranged for have always a liberal proportion of English. Special prayers show a practical

acknowledgment of the theory that Judaism is a "universal" religion: "an Englishman of the Jewish persuasion" is their underlying hypothesis. The same thing may be said of the majority of pulpit utterances. The festivals on which any stress is now laid are the five Pentateuchal festivals only. These are regarded far more from their human and spiritual than from their national or racial aspects. It is true that the theory of the perfect and Mosaic law is still nominally adhered to, it is also true that the Synagogue services are still arranged upon that theory's truth, but none the less is it being slowly but surely undermined. Hardly any Jewish preacher would openly venture to maintain it; books which assume the accuracy of the main critical positions are coming more and more into use. Before long the divorce between belief and ritual will become too glaring to be overlooked or tolerated any longer. A great deal depends on the willingness of liberals to work, to endure and to hope for a future which they can never themselves see. The sentence from Cicero which George Eliot chose for the motto of her great Comtist hymn should be our motto too: *Longum illud tempus quum non ero magis me movet quam hoc exiguum.*

I admit that the difficulties are many, and that the Pentateuchal question is grave. But many and grave difficulties are not necessarily insoluble. "Reformed" Judaism does not, as is often alleged, cut itself off from the past. Its cardinal proposition is that the religious utility of Judaism is not yet ended: in other words, the Mission of Israel did not close with the birth of Christ. He who believes in that doctrine is still a Jew, even though he also believes that the Pentateuch is neither perfect nor Mosaic. Even as things are now, the mass of Jewish Theists are not by any means without value. They are still witnesses for God. They are witnesses for that pure and ardent Theism which I have described as standing between two great opposing forces to-day. How much greater might that force become if all the "nominals" were close adherents,

exercising, when opportunity offered, a steady pressure in the direction of liberalism and of reform. The Mission of Israel can still be a driving power for us all. The blood of the martyrs cries out to us still. Not the closest reasoning and the most critical analysis can prove that their faith and courage, their sufferings and tortures, were all for nothing. We may still believe that their blood was shed for a cause which was not dead then, and is not dead now.

What then, in conclusion, is the duty of liberal and "nominal" Jews at the present time? First of all, the "nominals" must be "nominals" no more. Liberalism is required; "nominalism" is impeding and detrimental. In what ways, then, should the liberals act? The reply has, in part, been already anticipated and implied. There are four different methods in which they can help Judaism as a whole, liberal Judaism in particular, and the cause of Theism.

(1) In the first place they can help to maintain their own Jewish consciousness, and the Jewish consciousness of their children, by an active participation in communal work and communal charity. This is subsidiary to any religious action in the more definite sense of the word, but it is none the less important. It helps to keep up the bond, to quicken the Jewish consciousness, in a season of difficulty and transition. Sacrifice of time and money for communal purposes cannot be impeded by theological differences and difficulties, and will serve to keep alive the sense of brotherhood. Here then is a definite duty—an opportunity within the reach of many, if not of all.

(2) If the first method is one about which, given the fundamental dogma that Judaism is worth preserving, there can be little dispute or difference, not less so is the second. And with it we come to duties that are more definitely religious. *The Jewish religious consciousness must be maintained within the home.* This is a matter of considerable difficulty, and it must involve a large measure of deliberate action and earnest thought. There may be,



indeed there are, many liberals who neither go to the ordinary synagogue services themselves nor allow or desire their children to attend them. All the greater is the obligation upon them to maintain the Jewish religious consciousness within the home. *How* this is to be done, and whether it does not require, especially for boys and girls, a certain number of forms and ceremonies, is for each liberal individually to consider and to determine. But *that* it should be done seems abundantly clear. If liberal Jews must stand aloof from the existing synagogue services and government, and are also as yet unable to form separate synagogues of their own, so much the more urgent is it that each liberal home should be a small centre of religion and of Judaism. If children are not to become keen Jewish Theists by the help of the synagogue, they must become so through the home. Upon every Jewish parent then who believes that, for the sake of religion, Judaism is worth preserving, and should be preserved, the obligation is distinct and heavy. From generation to generation the Witness must be handed down, faithfully, earnestly, deliberately.

(3) When the time may become propitious for any distinct liberal movement or for any separate religious organization, I will not here discuss. Some persons would say that it is not a question of the season, but of the man. If it be so, we can at all events, by faithful and quiet labour, prepare the way for his coming.

(4) Lastly, some liberals may find it possible, and in accordance with their conscience, to maintain even within the existing synagogue organizations a closer connexion with the main body. They will, as I have already indicated, attempt to reform from within. Here again a good deal of self-sacrifice will be required of them; a large measure of faith. The services which they will have to attend may for a long time continue (in the majority of cases) to be dull, unaesthetic, unedifying. The Law will still occupy a position from which their understanding and reason will

revolt. They may still have to hear the prayers read or chanted in a dead language: the prayers themselves may remain unrevised. Orientalism and nationalism may still be all too evident. Nevertheless, they may cheer themselves with the belief that the increasing pressure of liberalism from within must gradually produce its effect. Even within the "orthodox" community itself, there have been organized children's services, which every liberal might well regard as a rare privilege and opportunity for his children to attend.

Even for our cause in England we must not lose hope. Little by little the new ideas will permeate and percolate more and more. The need for harmony between belief and practice will become stronger; slowly, but surely, outward form will become the true expression of inward faith. It may be that the mournful position of Jews upon the continent of Europe may make it undesirable to attempt any pronounced liberal movement or agitation for some time to come. But seed can be sown: ground can be prepared. The mere advance of knowledge will of itself be an effectual ally. Above all, if the children of many liberals and nominals could be more closely attached to the community, and if a considerable mass of outlying spirituality and of religion (including, as we have seen, some of high worth and rare nobility) could be, as it were, infused and incorporated into its general life, the gain would be enormous.

Hard it is to discern and understand the purposes of God. But, for my own part, I do not believe that the religious mission of the Jewish race terminated with the production of Christianity. And if it did not, then I venture to submit that the general line of religious action (in one or other of its forms), which I have urged upon the liberal Jews of England, is not merely a reasonable policy, but a solemn duty and a sacred obligation.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.